

Questions and Answers

Licensing

- Q 1. What is the potential of implementing an On-line interactive NCOA^{Link} to allow interactive systems to check for address changes?
- A 1. There are no plans to implement a web based interactive NCOA^{Link} query at this time.
- Q 2. It was discussed several times in the meeting that the USPS[®] is not requiring developers to meet the 30-day requirement as stated in the Developer License Agreement. This narrow window is excellent for companies who are implementing an administrative change (i.e. using a new PAF Form). However, this requirement is unrealistic for developers. Most companies have a minimum of 90 days from the final specification to having the end users implement and use the changes.
- A 2. The USPS acknowledges that there are occasions when development time will exceed the 30-day requirement and has allowed for this in the Developer License agreement, specifically in Section 6.5 "Developer must modify its Interface within thirty (30) days of receipt of USPS changes to the Licensed Materials, or such other periods of time as required by USPS."
- Q 3. Scenarios were discussed where less than 100 records could be processed that were part of much larger mailings. Can an official response be provided that the licensee (Service Provider or End User) is responsible for this minimum?
- A 3. Licensees are not allowed to process files of less than 100 unique names and addresses. However, it is noted that a licensee may breakup a large file for throughput management purposes. Consolidators must have at least 100 unique names and addresses per customer.
- As stated in the NCOA^{Link} License, mailing lists of at least 100 unique names and addresses are required for NCOA^{Link} processing.
- Q 4. How does the USPS define cloud computing in relation to the term "Site" in the NCOA^{Link} License? Cloud computing allows the use of virtual computer resources that are not easy to define in terms of physical locations.
- A 4. The USPS has defined "site" as the physical location where the NCOA^{Link} database resides. If cloud computing involves multiple computers at different sites, then additional site licenses are required as necessary.

Processing Acknowledgement Form (PAF)

- Q 5. Can the Licensee sign a single PAF for all marketing tests on potential customer files?
- A 5. The customer does not have to complete a PAF. When the marketing test is processed, only resultant summary reports may be provided to the customer. The licensee is then required to provide the name of the entity the test is being completed for in positions 1423-1452 of the NCOA^{Link} Customer Service Log.
- Q 6. Will the USPS provide a checklist of steps for licensees to use showing that due diligence is being met?
- A 6. The USPS has placed the responsibility of verifying the identity and role of all parties involved in the NCOA^{Link} Process (including, but not limited to, brokers, list administrators and list owners) upon the Licensee. The USPS has clearly stated the licensees must 'know their customer'. At

this time the USPS will not post a “checklist of steps” for licensees.

Q 7. What steps are being taken to protect licensees from other licensees who do not ‘play by the rules’?

A 7. The NCOA^{Link} license states licensees have an obligation to know their customers and who they are providing address information to. If information is falsely provided, it is the licensees’ responsibility to notify the USPS. As long as due diligence is demonstrated, licensees will not be held accountable.

If licensees become aware that resellers are not in compliance with the PAF guidelines, licensees must notify the USPS. The USPS will not provide feedback for the actions taken when issues of non-compliance are reported.

Q 8. In regards to the PAF, how do we proceed if the user has multiple Mailer IDs?

A 8. A valid mailer ID of the List Owner should be used in this optional field.

Q 9. If we have a client doing business as (D/B/A) ABC Company, DEF Company and XYZ Company, must a PAF be completed for each DBA if there is a single Custodian for the lists?

A 9. Yes.

Per the LPR “A single PAF may be completed to cover processing for all lists submitted by the list owner provided that the officer signing the document has the authority to do so for each separate list. If multiple lists are covered by a single PAF, the Licensee must record “MULTIPLE” in the space provided for the PAF ID on the pre-printed PAF. When “MULTIPLE” appears as the PAF ID, an itemization of the list names and corresponding PAF IDs assigned to each must be recorded on the back of the PAF.”

However as each of these D/B/A entities are managed separately, a separate PAF must be completed for each entity.

Q 10. If a client moves, do we need to assign a new PAF ID?

A 10. No. The new address can be added to the current PAF.

Q 11. If a client changes their business name, do we need to assign a new PAF ID?

A 11. No. However, a client must sign a new PAF with the new business name.

Q 12. If a client is bought out by another business entity, do we need to assign a new PAF ID?

A 12. Not if the other business entity already has a PAF ID on file with the licensee. Two scenarios are provided below to provide further explanation.

- ABC Company acquires XYZ Company. ABC Company and XYZ Company are both customers of the same licensee. No new PAF would be required, processing for XYZ company would then fall under ABC Company’s PAF.
- ABC Company acquires XYZ Company. XYZ Company has a PAF ID with the licensee and ABC Company does not. A new PAF ID would be required.

Q 13. Is there any plan to change the PAF and BALA (Broker-Agent/List Administrator) logs such that foreign phone/zip/country information can be accommodated?

A 13. No. not at this time.

Q 14. Broker registration

- The concept of a Broker registration method should be implemented and my company would volunteer to develop a plan. The registration process could dramatically improve PAF processes for licensees, and likely for the USPS as well.
- Allowing Brokers to send Service Providers a Broker ID or PAF would be an excellent change.

- Brokers would collect the PAF and assign a PAF ID
- Brokers would submit the required PAF Information directly to the USPS.
- The licensee would report the Broker ID and Broker assigned PAF ID to the USPS.

A 14. This concept will continue to be explored.

Q 15. Are there plans to release what Equivalent Alternative Methods for PAFs are being used by Licensees or will it remain undisclosed?

A 15. Yes, confidentiality will be maintained. However if there is a consensus method that the industry has elected to pursue, it may become the standard method.

Q 16. How might we go about re-evaluating the need to include the 'required text' in PAFs?

A 16. The Required Text Document (RTD) will not be eliminated, as it describes to the recipient of the service (a) how the NCOA^{Link} Service works, (b) various processing options and (c) limitations of the product. The List Owner on the PAF signs the PAF indicating that s/he has received and reviewed the "NCOA^{Link} Information Package." The Licensee Performance Requirements state that this package must at a minimum contain all information presented in the RTD. (Reference: FSP LPR Section 8.1 and LSP LPR Section 7.1)

Q 17. How long will licensees be given to comply with a PAF audit?

A 17. With remote PAF audits, the licensee will be given a maximum of five business days from the date of notification to provide the requested PAFs.

Required Text Document (RTD)

Q 18. The opening paragraph of the current Service Provider Required Text Document (RTD) is misleading and does not clearly define the level of license held by the licensee. Will the USPS post separate RTDs for Full and Limited Service Providers?

RTD Language: <<Service Provider>> is a non-exclusive Licensee of the USPS[®] (United States Postal Service[®]) to provide Full and/or Limited Service NCOA^{Link®} processing.

A 18. The USPS will not post separate RTDs for all licensees. However, the opening paragraph will be modified to allow the licensee to reflect their level(s) of processing.

New Language:

<<Service Provider>> is a non-exclusive Licensee of the USPS[®] (United States Postal Service[®]) to provide <<Full/Limited/Full and Limited>> Service NCOA^{Link®} processing.

For example, a Licensed Full Service Provider could use:

<<ABC Company>> is a non-exclusive Licensee of the USPS[®] (United States Postal Service[®]) to provide Full Service NCOA^{Link®} processing.

Q 19. Are we still required to submit the edited "Required Text Document" for review (see July 21, 2006 e-mail)?

A 19. Yes, per the License Agreement, all advertising must be reviewed and approved by the USPS.

Reporting

Q 20. Will the USPS[®] implement FTP Submission for reports as the size of some emails will exceed email system limits? Will the USPS consider requiring use of the 'current general release' of WinZip? Also, will there be an allowance for password protected files?

A 20. Yes, the USPS will be implementing a process for licensees to upload their reports to the USPS

RIBBS™ website.

No, the USPS will not require use of the 'current general release' of WinZip. However, all submissions must be compatible with WinZip version 9.0.

The USPS is reviewing the allowance for password protected files.

- Q 21. PAF log files changes: It was noted several times at the conference that none of the reporting changes caused changes in the size or structure of the files that we submit, but the new rules for the PAF log seem to violate this- as the PAF log file record length has changed from 600 to 620. The old log file record as described in the LSP_LPR had the following for the last 3 fields and CR/LF:

490 599 Filler 110 X(110)

600 600 RECORD TYPE

H = Header / D = Detail 1 X(1)

CR/LF Carriage Return/Line Feed required at end of each record. While Slide 25 of the presentations shows the Last two fields as:

* Company Website in position 555-619

* Equivalent Alternative PAF Indicator in position 620

Note that both now go beyond 600. Shouldn't all of the fields be limited to the old Filler space and have the record still end at 600?

- A 21. Yes. The USPS has reviewed the field lengths and is providing a final corrected version. The USPS has elected to resize the Company Website field to 40 bytes and reposition the "Equivalent Alternative PAF Indicator" field (position 594) to maintain the 600 byte record length.

- Q 22. Is it OK to have blank fields or must we enter N/A as we transition to the new CSL and PAF log formats?

- A 22. The USPS has determined any text fields that are required, but do not have data (e.g., Parent Company Name) should be space filled. The "N/A requirement" for new fields has been removed.

- Q 23. Equivalent Alternate PAF Indicator – What are the correct values for this field? Y vs. N, or 0 vs. 1, or A vs. O, or what? Does BLANK mean unknown or is this a required field?

- A 23. The Literal "A" is the correct value for this field or space filled. This is a required field only when an alternative PAF is being used. The Literal 'A' should populate the field when an alternative PAF is collected. If the traditional PAF is used, then the field should be SPACE FILLED.

Other Products

- Q 24. DSF^{2®}: Since the PAF no longer requires us to capture the Tax ID for NCOA^{Link} processing, do we still need to capture and report the Tax ID for DSF²?

- A 24. No. The DSF² Report Layout in the DSF² LPR will be updated to reflect this field as Filler.

- Q 25. DPV[®]: We need to find out about date representation for weekly updates that do not correspond to a monthly release?

- A 25. The licensee should continue to provide the corresponding monthly AIS Product Data Date.

- Q 26. DPV: Are there enough delivery point changes to warrant a weekly release?

- A 26. Yes. Use of the weekly transactional updates will be optional. During the 2007 calendar year, the Address Quality Department reported an overall change of 2,727,763 records. The weekly add/delete statistics show between 4-5 million added records and 1-2 million deleted records.

All of these records aren't true delivery points because these totals also reflect alternates, LACS conversions, etc.

Q 27. DPV: Will DPV weekly be synchronized with DSF²?

A 27. Yes.

Data Integrity

Q 28. What is the impact of OneCode ACS[®] on NCOA^{Link} processing volumes.

A 28. With the implementation of OneCode ACS, the USPS has noted no impact to NCOA^{Link} processing volumes. In fact, total records processed increased approximately by 40 billion from FY07 to FY08 for NCOA^{Link}.

Q 29. Not all address changes flow through NCOA^{Link} because customers are not providing the USPS with their moves. What efforts are under way to increase the rate from 60 to 100 percent?

A 29. USPS has made it more convenient for customers to file their changes of address orders with such programs as Movers Guide, TCOA (Telephone Change of Address), ICOA (Internet Change of Address), etc. While the USPS encourages everyone to file a change of address order when they move, it is not a requirement.

Q 30. There are a number of anomalies within the USPS reference files is there any work under way to clean up the files.

A 30. At this time, the USPS is unable to correct unreported anomalies without specific information.

Q 31. Does using the 18-month database, compared to the 48-month database, allow many old side addresses to be put in the mail stream? If the USPS has a target to reduce UAA mail by 50% by 2010 then this issue could be key.

A 31. No, because the bulk of NCOA^{Link} matches occur during the first 18 months of a customer's move.

New/Additional Products

Q 32. Will the USPS provide Full Service Providers with the AEC History file?

A 32. At this time, there is no intent to provide licensees with the AEC History file.

Q 33. Will the USPS consider the reimplementation of the old 'Nixie' logic for processing? The licensees feel there is great value to do so..

A 33. The USPS will take this under consideration.

Move Update

Q 34. Are we Move Update Complaint when we reject moves using a client-provided date? The client date has to be older than 6 months.

A 34. No. For qualification of postal price discounts, mailers must use one of the approved methods (i.e. NCOA^{Link}) and after 95 days the mailer must provide the updated address on all mailpieces presented to the USPS for mailing at discounted prices.

Testing

Q 35. Will the USPS consider synchronizing CASS[™] and NCOA^{Link} into one test? Is there a

timeframe available for delivery of a combined test?

A 35. Yes, the USPS is looking at providing a combined NCOA^{Link}/CASS test. A time line has not been established at this time.

Q 36. Are the changes for the DPV vs. NCOA^{Link} timing issue (slide 18) being implemented or not?

A 36. Refer to the Technical Changes Presentation Summary on page 13 in the minutes.

General Processing Issues

Q 37. Can a 'mail date' be introduced into the NCOA^{Link} process, allowing for the licensee to use information regarding future and temporary moves?

A 37. The USPS will take this under advisement.

Q 38. How should a new address provided by the NCOA^{Link} Product that does not fully process (i.e. does not DPV confirm) be handled? Do these addresses meet DPV requirement to assign a ZIP + 4 and how would it be counted on PS Form 3553?

A 38. Any new-side address returned from the NCOA^{Link} Process should be considered DPV confirmed. The PS Form 3553 DPV counts will not be impacted.

Q 39. Has the policy changed with regard to returning only the Movers to the client to update their database? Many of our clients are telling us that other Licensees are providing this service.

A 39. No, the policy has not changed. Please reference the following sections in each license agreement: Full 2.3 and 2.4; Limited 2.2 and 2.3.

In addition to the questions above, the following suggestions were also received. The USPS appreciates all input and will give fair consideration to all ideas.

S 1. Reduce mailing to a Person's Prior Address by:

a. Requiring the Move Card to record the names of all persons in the household for a household move:

- i. Possibly limited to only report adults (persons 18 and older),
- ii. Possibly including all married name(s) and maiden name.

b. Retain the ability to flag persons who have moved between four and eight years ago, that is, not retain the new move-to address, if this could be done, without filing in the "Federal Register". (If a filing in the Federal Register is required, then I would propose Doubling the move retention period to eight years and making providing the new address optional.)

c. Add a redesign of the form/website so as to ensure that a single person that is moving ends up checking "Family". People think of themselves as individuals, so when asked to check individual or family I am certain that a lot of people check individual, and that inhibits matching.

S 2. Note that there are at least 30% to possibly 40% of the persons that have moved that are not on the USPS NCOA^{Link} file, that is 1/3 of the persons who have moved are not in the NCOA^{Link} file. There needs to be a better job of marketing and public relations to get people to submit there moves to the USPS/

S 3. Reduced Mailing to Deceased Persons by:

- Using the data (including address) provided by funeral homes to the SSA to be added to the NCOALink file after editing by the SSA and / or
- Allowing spouses, children or executives of the deceased estate to file an NCOALink Move Card with either DECEASED written in the new address line or a check box provided for Deceased.
- The file owner would not be required to remove the Deceased record from their file(s).

S 4. Allow the USPS to maintain a file of all name and address combinations filed with the USPS on

an ongoing basis with the move-to and move-from dates when available. Mandate that the USPS create a SHA encoded form of this file to be provided to FSPs for the purpose of flagging records as a current address as of a specified date, or a prior address as of a specified date. This would allow file owners to remove or flag records as probably confirmed as a prior address, or not confirmed, that could be used with other information available to the file owner in making the decision to retain or remove records from their file.

a. Allow the SSA to provide SSA name, address and dates to the USPS for these purposes.

b. Allow the IRS to provide IRS name, address and dates to the USPS for these purposes.

So basically the USPS, SSA and IRS create a national database of every individual in the country in SHA encoding form. The industry would then use that data to confirm the validity of the name and address combinations in their databases. While name address combinations that do not confirm are not necessarily undeliverable, they would be questionable. Each database owner, using other information they have about the unconfirmed records would either retain or not retain those records. For instance, if the record is from a new phone connection, the record would probably be retained. Since the information is in SHA encoded form, there would be no name or address information derivable from this file.

- S 5. Allow the USPS to provide FSPs in SHA encoded form of known name address pairs that have been undeliverable some specified minimum number of times in the past n years. This might be an ANK^{Link} for years 5+ from NCOA^{Link} as well as ACS records that were not in NCOA^{Link}.
- S 6. USPS Partner with various large cell phone companies, publishers and similar organizations with the need to maintain the current address for its clients to allow those clients to notify the USPS of a move when they are notifying their vendor of a move. N The USPS would perform its normal verification of the move after being notified by their business partner.